



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,303	12/02/2005	Colin Dunlop	GRIHAC P44AUS	3549
20210	7590	12/19/2007	EXAMINER	
DAVIS BUJOLD & Daniels, P.L.L.C. 112 PLEASANT STREET CONCORD, NH 03301			PAPAPIETRO, JACQUELINE M	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3739		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/19/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/538,303	DUNLOP, COLIN
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Jacqueline Papapietro	3739

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jacqueline Papapietro. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Scott Daniels. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 12 December 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 15,27 and 37.

Identification of prior art discussed: Berke and Hagopian.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant and Examiner discussed the outstanding rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed 7/12/07 and discussed distinctions between the instant invention and the prior art. Proposed amendments were discussed. It appears that amending the claims to include a limitation regarding the warm air being passed through the entire surface area of the pervious material, and not discrete holes, would overcome the 102 rejection under Berke.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



LINDA C. M. DVORAK  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 3700

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

*Jmp*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required